DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 432 95 TM 005 617

AUTHOR Reinhard, Diane L.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation Designs for the Improving Teaching Competencies Program Dissemination Strategies.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Basic Skills Group. Learning Div.
PUB DATE Jun 76
CONTRACT 400-76-0046
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Diffusion; *Evaluation Methods; Individualized Instruction; *Information Dissemination; *Instructional Systems; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS Improving Teaching Competencies Program

ABSTRACT

Evaluation designs are presented for these work components of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP): (1) developing, implementing, and evaluating a strategy for disseminating selected ITCP instructional systems in Individually Guided Education (IGE) schools; (2) developing, implementing, and evaluating a strategy for disseminating ITCP instructional systems in the Florida Teacher Center network; and (3) planning, implementing, and evaluating three regional workshops using selected ITCP instructional systems. The first section of the report contains: (1) the context for this evaluation, including purpose, constraints, and primary audiences; (2) a description of the dissemination/diffusion strategies being evaluated; (3) objectives of the strategies; (4) questions to be answered in this evaluation; and (5) sequencing and emphasis of the evaluation. The second section includes descriptions of evaluation investigations to be conducted, the designs, variable emphasis, and means of data collection. The third section contains a plan for providing the information obtained. Contained in the appendices are: (1) worksheets summarizing the evaluation questions, sources of information, instrumentation, and analysis suggestions; (2) time schedules for various evaluation activities; (3) complete descriptions of contents of training to be conducted; and (4) preliminary drafts of instruments. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128432

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM SP

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Evaluation Designs for the Improving Teaching Competencies Program Dissemination Strategies

TM005 617

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

July 1976

Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation. The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0046, with the Basic Skills Group/Learning Difision of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 710 S. W. Second Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204

EVALUATION DESIGNS FOR THE IMPROVING TEACHING COMPETENCIES PROGRAM DISSEMINATION STRATEGIES

Prepared by

Diane L. Reinhard for the
Improving Teaching Competencies
Program Dissemination Work Unit

With the Assistance of

John Lohman, Program Director
William Ward, Work Unit Coordinator
Marilyn Rieff, Associate Work Unit
Coordinator

June 1976

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S. W. Second Avenue/Lindsay Building
Portland, Oregon 97204

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION	3
Purpose of the Evaluation	3
Description of the Dissemination Strategies	4
Individually Guided Education Network	4
Florida Teacher Center Network Intervention	6
Regional Workshop Intervention	7
Goals and Objectives	8
Evaluation Questions	10
Sequence and Emphasis of the Evaluation	15
METHODS OF OBTAINING THE EVALUATION INFORMATION	17
IGE/FTC Network Intervention	17
Regional Workshop Intervention	20
REPORTING PROCEDURES	23
APPENDICES	24
Appendix A: Worksheet for the Evaluation	25
Appendix B: Planned Time Sequence and Staffing	37
Appendix C: Descriptions of ITCP Instructional System Used in Training	39
Appendix D: Workshop Organizer Questionnaire	55
Appendix E: Workshop Trainer Questionnaire	58
Appendix F: Participant Background Information Sheet	61
Appendix G: Workshop Trainer Observation Sheet	65
Appendix H: Post-session Participant Questionnaire	68
Appendix I: Post-session Participant Questionnaire (IGE third week session only)	71
Appendix J: Participant Follow-up Questionnaire	74
Appendix K: Log Instructions	76
Appendix L: Contact Record Form	78

INTRODUCTION

The Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit (FRDWU) of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP) has the following work components to complete: (1) developing a Technical Assistance Unit (TAU), (2) developing a conceptual model to guide dissemination and diffusion of ITCP instructional systems and other programs or products with similar aims and formats, (3) developing, implementing and evaluating a strategy for disseminating selected ITCP instructional systems in Individually Guided Education (IGE) schools in collaboration with the Wisconsin Research and Development Center, (4) developing, implementing and evaluating a strategy for disseminating ITCP instructional systems in the Florida Teacher Center network, (5) planning, implementing and evaluating three regional workshops using selected ITCP instructional systems, and (6) serving in a field relations capacity to set up field test sites for the *Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving* instructional system of the ITCP. In addition, the FRDWU is participating in Inter-Lab Consortium activities designed to explore different ways to increase utilization of products of serveral research and development efforts.

The purpose of this report is to present evaluation designs for work components 3, 4 and 5. These three components represent initial efforts by the FRDWU to examine alternative ways of dissemination/diffusion of the instructional systems of ITCP.[1]

A conceptual model designed to serve as a guide for current and future dissemination and diffusion activities of the ITCP has been developed.[2] The three strategies this evaluation design addresses (the regional worksh[illegible],

---

[1]Factors leading to the selection of these alternatives and more complete descriptions are provided on pp 4-8.

[2]See Arends, Richard I., *Strategies for Disseminating and Diffusing the Ideas, Practices and Products of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program*, June, 1976.

the Individually Guided Education (IGE) Network intervention and the Florida Teacher Center (FTC) Network intervention) are examples of the second and third categories of strategies proposed in the conceptual paper by Arends:

> . . . 2. Market workshop experiences using intact instructional systems to individuals
>
> 3. Provide training of trainers and technical assistance using intact instructional systems to institutions and agencies wishing to adapt and use components of ITCP curriculum. . .[3]

Related evaluation designs for other dissemination/diffusion activities include: *Evaluation Design for the Establishment of a Technical Assistance Unit in the Improving Teaching Competencies Program* (June 1976) and *Evaluation Design for Preparing Educational Training Consultants: A Field Experiment* (April 1976).

This report is divided into three main sections and includes several appendices. The first section describes: (1) the context for this evaluation, including its purpose, constraints and the primary audiences, (2) a description of the dissemination/diffusion strategies being evaluated, (3) objectives of the strategies, (4) questions to be answered in this evaluation, and (5) sequencing and emphasis of the evaluation. The second section includes descriptions of evaluation investigations to be conducted, the designs, variable emphasis, and means of data collection. The third section contains a plan for providing the information obtained. Contained in the appendices are (1) worksheets summarizing the evaluation questions, sources of information, instrumentation, and analysis suggestions, (2) time schedules for various evaluation activities, (3) complete descriptions of contents of training to be conducted, and (4) preliminary drafts of instruments.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 19

CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose of the Evaluation

In many ways the dissemination strategies being evaluated represent the best judgments of project personnel and outside consultants at this time. Since these types of dissemination activities are relatively innovative, the information base on how to proceed is insufficient. Therefore, the primary purpose of the evaluation design is to provide information related to the feasibility of each strategy based upon initial implementation efforts. Specifically, the results of this evaluation will provide (1) a complete description of each strategy used and the rationale for various program components, (2) an indication of the degree to which the dissemination/diffusion objectives have been achieved, and (3) a greater understanding of the degree to which selected variables appear to influence effectiveness. In many ways this design is similar to a context evaluation[4] which provides information on the needs, problems and opportunities of a system so better planning decisions can be made.

Several constraints impinge upon this evaluation design. The first constraint is the short time-span between implementation of each strategy and the end of the funding cycle. Since this severely limits the ability to detect actual achievement of dissemination/diffusion objectives, continued data collection efforts are proposed beyond the November 30, 1976 date. The second constraint is the relatively low information base which exists regarding these dissemination/diffusion strategies. Because of this condition, the evaluation should be viewed as important in the identification of hypotheses which will need further study.

---

[4]Originally discriminated by Daniel L. Stufflebeam, editor, *Educational Evaluation and Decision Making*, Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1971

The evaluative information about these strategies

to the needs of three audiences.

1. Personnel in the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit within ITCP and the marketing staff of Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) for possible revisions and/or extensions of dissemination/diffusion strategies for Lab products

2. Other product developers and disseminators who may potentially use the results of the evaluation in designing dissemination/diffusion strategies for their systems

3. Members of the National Institute of Education (NIE) who monitor the progress and assess the quality of output from the ITCP and the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit

Description of the Dissemination Strategies

Three different dissemination/diffusion strategies have been selected by the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit for field trials during fiscal year 1976. The descriptions which follow include:

1. Details of planned activities

2. Factors leading to selection of each strategy

3. Relationship of each strategy to the conceptual model

Individually Guided Education Network Intervention

The purpose of this strategy is to develop, implement and evaluate an approach for disseminating selected ITCP instructional systems into IGE schools by providing training to personnel in the Midwest IGE Institute in collaboration with the Wisconsin R & D Center. The Midwest IGE Institute is the dissemination agency for IGE-related program elements. Workshops will be provided in two ITCP instructional systems without major modification (Interpersonal Communications [IPC] and the first week of *Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Skills Training (PETC-I)*.[5] A two-day

[5]A complete description of these instructional systems including intended users, main emphasis, intents (contents, main activities, provisions for use, conditions for use and cost range) is provided in Appendix C.

micro-lab will be conducted to enable participants to gain an awareness of the other instructional systems developed by ITCP. In addition, a three-day training session will be provided to instruct the trainees to install, adapt and apply the ITCP instructional systems in IGE schools.

A number of factors led to the selection of this network intervention. First, NWREL has worked with the Wisconsin R&D Center in providing training in ITCP instructional systems for the past four years. This training was viewed as helpful for facilitating the needed changes in schools that were implementing the Individually Guided Education programs. Also, the Wisconsin R&D Center and NWREL are working together on the Inter-Lab Consortium dissemination activities. Other reasons that made this strategy attractive were as follows: short lead-in time needed for implementation, strategy maintained fidelity of products, little additional development required, inexpensive to implement, multiplier effect of "each one teach one" maintained and the strategy capitalized on using existing personnel capabilities in ITCP and the marketing office at NWREL.

The Individually Guided Education Network Intervention is an example of the third category of dissemination and diffusion strategies outlined in the conceptual paper.

> Provide training of trainers and technical assistance using source intact instructional systems to institutions and agencies wishing to adapt and use components of ITCP curriculum. . .[6]

The ITCP has more experience with this type of strategy than any other of the seven categories presented in the conceptual model. In general, the success of this strategy is in terms of the extent to which the new curricula is implemented and incorporated by the user institution or agency.

---

[6]Op. Cit., p. 19

Florida Teacher Center Network Intervention

The purpose of this strategy is to develop, implement and evaluate a strategy for disseminating ITCP instructional systems in the Florida Teacher Center Network by providing training and technical assistance to personnel in selected teacher centers in the Tampa Bay area. A one-week workshop will be provided in *Preparing Educational Training Consultants (PETC-I).*[7] In addition, some instruction will be provided to prepare participants to assume the role of trainer in their home setting.

The decision to select the Florida Teacher Center Network was based on many of the same factors that were identified as important to the decision of working with the IGE network. Previous working relationship with faculty in teacher training institutions have resulted in a number of instructional systems being offered as courses either on a preservice or inservice basis in the State of Florida. Also, Florida Teacher Centers were formed several years ago with a legislative authorization of $5.00 per student for support of their activities. Representatives from ITCP made presentations on their systems at this time to FTC personnel and many felt that these systems responded directly to inservice training needs of Florida teachers. The selection of instructional systems is dependent upon a needs assessment by teachers. ITCP systems will be listed in a catalog of possible training opportunities for teachers this coming year. The opportunity for extensive additional training in cooperation with the Teacher Centers was a major reason for selection of this dissemination alternative. The other factors that were identified as important to the IGE decision and also are applicable to this decision are as follows: short-lead-in time needed, fidelity of products

---

[7]A complete description of this instructional system is provided in Appendix C

maintained, no additional development needed, low cost, multiplier effect of "each one teach one" maintained and no additional staff necessary for implementation.

The Florida Teacher Center Network is another example of the third category of dissemination and diffusion strategies outlined in the Arends paper (1976). (See pages 5, 6 for a description of this category, ITCP experience with this type of strategy and criteria for success.)

Regional Workshop Intervention

The purpose of this strategy is to develop, implement and evaluate an approach for disseminating selected ITCP systems by providing workshops in three different locations (Denver, Portand and San Francisco). Direct mailing is used to announce workshop topics and dates. A tuition charge has been selected to defray the costs in conducting the workshops. The three instructional systems selected for these workshops include: Denver, *Interpersonal Communications;* Portland, *Group Process Skills;* and San Francisco, *Interpersonal Influence.*[8]

The implementation of this strategy represents a departure from previous approaches used to disseminate instructional systems developed by ITCP. Several factors influenced the selection of this alternative. First, this method has been used successfully by a number of training organizations, e.g., National Training Laboratories, American Education Research Association. Second, the strategy allows for individuals to decide to participate independent of an agency commitment. The ITCP has in the past received requests from individuals wishing to participate in various instructional systems, however, the ITCP has not

[8]Complete descriptions of these systems are presented in Appendix C.

up until this time provided the opportunity. Other factors that influenced the selection of this strategy include: no additional development work required, the fidelity of the products maintained, cost reimbursed through tuition fee, multiplier effect of "each one teach one" maintained, and no additional staff required to implement the strategy.

The Regional Workshop concept is an example of the second category of dissemination and diffusion strategies outlined in the conceptual model.

> Market workshop experiences using intact instructional systems to individuals

This strategy, if successful, would sell ITCP products and give opportunity for persons to have a "hands-on" experience with ITCP instructional systems. The focus is on creating an awareness of ITCP products and developing a readiness for more sustained training in the future. The success of this strategy is the extent to which the strategy can be self-supporting as well as lead to more requests for products, additional training, and consultation or technical assistance.

Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives for these three dissemination strategies are divided into two categories: (1) the IGE and FTC Network interventions, and (2) the Regional Workshop intervention. The combination of the two network interventions is appropriate since these two strategies are similar in purpose and structure. A separate set of objectives is proposed for the Regional Workshop because of its emphasis on a different set of variables and differing expectation as to the level of achievement regarding dissemination outcomes.

IGE/FTC Network Intervention. Two major objectives are proposed for the IGE and FTC interventions.

1. Obtain greater understanding of the feasibility of this strategy as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems. As a result of these activities, the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit will be able to determine the following:

    a. Whether the approach appears generalizable to other networks

    b. What the major needs, problems and opportunities are in collaborative efforts such as these

    c. Whether the dissemination objectives have been achieved or the degree to which this strategy leads to the following:

        1. Knowledge of available products by participants
        2. Spread of knowledge of products from participants to others
        3. Use of products in IGE and FTC schools as a direct or indirect result of participant involvement in these sessions
        4. Degree to which product use is viewed as helpful to solving problems in IGE and FTC schools
        5. Further training in package use because strategy includes process of training "trainers" in midwest and southeast region (multiplier effect)
        6. Further training by participants in packages other than those used in training sessions

2. Obtain greater understanding of the variables which may affect the feasibility of this strategy as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems. As a result of these activities, the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit will have some indication of the degree to which the following classes of variables appear to be important considerations:

    a. Characteristics of participants

    b. Characteristics of schools

    c. Characteristics of the instructional system used

    d. Characteristics of the actual training received

Regional Workshop Intervention. Three objectives have been identified relating to the use of the Regional Workshop concept as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems.

1. Obtain greater understanding of the feasibility of this strategy as a means of dissemintating ITCP instructional systems. As a

result of these activities, the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit will be able to determine the following:

a. What are the needs, problems and opportunities in conducting Regional Workshops

b. Whether the dissemination objectives for the workshops have been achieved or the degree to which this strategy leads to the following:

1. Further training in other packages by participants
2. Agency use of products which can be directly or indirectly linked to workshop participation
3. Communication of lab products to others that can be traced to workshop participation

2. Greater understanding of the degree to which each workshop was effectively implemented as planned.[9]

3. Greater understanding of the variables which affect the feasibility of offering regional workshops as a dissemination alternative. As a result of these activities, the FRDWU should have an initial understanding of how the following variables affect decisions to attend workshops:

a. Location

b. Tuition cost and total participant cost

c. Workshop content

d. Time offered

Evaluation Questions

This section includes the major questions to be answered in the evaluation work described in this report. These questions form the basis of the evaluation studies described in the second section and are keyed to each study in the evaluation worksheets that are provided in Appendix A. Since separate objectives have been identified for the IGE and FTC intervention as well as the Regional Workshops, separate listings of associated evaluation questions will also be provided.

---

[9]The ability to attract participants will determine if workshops are offered; emphasis will shift to Objective 3 if workshops are cancelled.

IGE/FTC Evaluation Questions. Evaluation questions for the IGE and FTC intervention have been sorted into two major categories. These two categories correspond to the categories of objectives described on pages 9 and 10. In addition, evaluation questions relating to each subobjective are grouped together, thereby clarifying the relationship between the objectives and questions to be addressed.

Questions relating to the feasibility of this strategy as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems.

a. Whether the approach appears generalizable

1. To what degree do the IGE and Florida Teacher Centers serve as a good example of networks to be tapped for use?

2. To what extent are there a number of similar networks available in which the dissemination strategy can be tested?

3. How are characteristics of this network similar to others?

b. What the major needs, problems and opportunities are in collaborative efforts such as these

4. What are the antecedents and transactions involved in developing and implementing these collaborative relationships?

5. What factors inhibit collaborative efforts such as these?

6. What are the crucial elements of a successful collaboration effort of this nature?

7. What are the "spin offs" from these efforts?

8. To what degree would personnel from both institutions actively seek other collaborative arrangements?

9. To what degree are prior working relationships a necessary ingredient to entry into networks?

10. What are the characteristics of participants and organizers?

c. Whether the dissemination objectives have been acheived

11. To what degree are participants more knowledgeable about lab products as a result of their involvement?

12. To what degree is there greater use of lab products in IGE and Teacher Center schools which can be traced to involvement in these sessions either directly or indirectly?

13. To what degree did persons trained, train others?

14. To what degree did training in these products lead to future training by same participants in other products?

15. To what degree are products sold?

Questions relating to the understanding of the variables which may affect feasibility of strategy.

a. Characteristics of participants

16. To what degree are participants in positions to advise or influence budget allocation?

17. To what degree do participants have job responsibilities which include identification of needs and products which address these needs? Does job include influencing others in this regard?

18. To what extent are participants influential in their school context?

19. To what degree are participants committed to planned change as a means of problem solving?

20. To what extent do participants have high-priority problems which Lab products address?

21. To what degree do participants come to sessions with or without previous exposure to Lab products?

22. In what ways does the team approach provide additional incentive for use of products when participants return to jobs?

23. Can participants be released to conduct training?

b. Characteristics of schools

24. In what ways do budget problems prevent utilization of any products which have cost requirements?

25. To what extent do budget limitations rule out Lab product selection?

26. In what ways do IGE or FTC developed processes and products compete for limited resources? What are the critical competitors for limited dollars?

27. What is the degree to which IGE and FTC schools have perceived needs which Lab products address?

28. In what ways do IGE and Teacher Center schools have mechanisms for staff development which hinder or facilitate use of products and required training?

c. Characteristics of the instructional system used

29. To what degree is a compatible philosophy of products and networks a necessary prerequisite?

30. To what degree are requirements for Lab product use (prior participant training) a hinderance or asset to use in networks?

d. Characteristics of the actual training received

31. What is the rationale behind training format, selection of products used, and time allocation?

32. To what degree are the objectives for the sessions accomplished?

33. To what degree are the sessions well organized and delivery effective?

34. To what degree are accommodations conducive to effective training?

35. (For IGE only) In what ways will choice of options affect degree to which objectives are achieved?

36. (For IGE only) Is the two and one-half day design an effective way to provide instruction on adaptation?

37. (For IGE only) To what degree is the microlab an effective way to communicate information on other lab products?

Regional Workshop Evaluation Questions. The evaluation questions for the Regional Workshop intervention have been sorted into three major categories. These three categories correspond to the categories of objectives described on pages 9-10. In addition, evaluation questions relating to each sub-objective are grouped together, thereby clarifying the relationship between the objectives and questions to be addressed.

Questions relating to the feasiblity of this strategy as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems.

a. What are the needs, problems and opportunities in conducting Regional Workshops such as these

1. What are the antecedents and transactions involved in developing and implementing the regional workshop interventions?

2. What rationale is presented for implementing decisions regarding promotion, time, location, content and cost for participants?

3. In what ways do the outcomes of this endeavor support or reject the previous planning work on the regional workshops concept?[10]

4. What are the characteristics of participants, in terms of role, previous experience with ITCP programs, degree to which they personally paid for training?

5. To what degree was location, time, content, and cost a factor in participants' decisions to attend?

6. What can be learned from other institutions such as the National Training Laboratories and the American Education Research Association regarding recruitment and selection of participants, location, time, cost and content of training?

7. What is the degree to which the content and context of other institutions' use of regional workshops are comparable to NWREL's endeavors?

b. Degree to which dissemination objectives were achieved

8. What is the nature of further participant training in other Laboratory packages?

9. To what degree do participants "train" others in product use?

10. To what degree do agencies or individuals receive information on Lab products which can be traced either directly or indirectly to participant involvement in workshops?

11. To what degree are products and/or services sold to individuals or organizations as a result of previous workshop participation?

Questions relating to degree to which workshops were effectively implemented as planned.

12. Was the session well organized and delivery effective?

13. What is the degree to which accommodations were conducive to effective training?

14. What is the degree to which training objectives were accomplished?

---

[10]See report advocating use of Regional Workshops by S. Rath, *Marketing the Improving Teaching Competencies Program Training Systems*, December 1975.

Questions relating to greater understanding of the variables which affect the feasibility of offering regional workshops as a dissemination alternative.[11]

15. To what degree does the location of the workshop affect decision?

16. To what degree does the time of the workshop affect decision?

17. To what degree does the content of the session affect decision?

18. To what degree does cost (tuition, travel, lodging) affect decision?

Sequence and Emphasis of the Evaluation

Constraints for this evaluation, such as the evaluation staff allocation and the short time-frame between interventions and end of funding cycle, will influence the degree to which the 37 questions for the IGE and FTC intervention and the 18 questions for the Regional Workshops are addressed. In addition, some of the evaluation questions that can be answered in this time-frame are more future oriented than others. Table 1 identifies the following questions: (1) those which can and will be addressed this funding cycle, (2) those which can and may be addressed during the funding cycle, (3) those which can only be addressed on a superficial basis during this cycle, and (4) those which can only be answered in future evaluation efforts.

---

[11] The primary focus of these evaluative questions is to determine why those recruited chose not to attend.

TABLE 1
SEQUENCING AND EMPHASIS OF PROPOSED EVALUATION

CATEGORIES OF QUESTIONS	IGE/FTC INTERVENTION[a]	REGIONAL WORKSHOPS[b]
1. Questions to be answered during funding cycle.	4-10: Needs, problems and opportunities in collaborative efforts 31-37: Characteristics of actual training received	1-5: Needs, problems and opportunities in collaborative efforts 12-14: Characteristics of actual training received 15-18: Effects of location, cost, content, and time on decisions to attend
2. (Optional) questions to be answered during funding cycle.	1-3: Generalizable approach	6-7: Potential learnings from other similar efforts
3. Questions which can be answered only superficially during funding cycle.	11-15: Dissemination objectives	8-11: Dissemination objectives
4. Questions proposed for comprehensive treatment beyond funding cycle.	11-15: Dissemination objectives 16-30: Feasibility variables, e.g., participants, schools and instructional system used	8-11: Dissemination objectives

[a]Questions 1-37 for the IGE/FTC Networks can be found on pages 11-13.
[b]Questions 1-18 for the Regional Workshops can be found on pages 13-15.

METHODS OF OBTAINING THE EVALUATION INFORMATION

This evaluation will be conducted to collect information on the feasibility of three dissemination strategies. This section contains descriptions of investigations to be conducted, different data collection methods that will be used, the purpose of the activity, and when appropriate, samples, analysis and standards will be suggested. The same format that was used for presenting the objectives and evaluation questions will be used here since different means of data collection are projected for the IGE/FTC network intervention and the Regional Workshop intervention.

IGE/FTC Network Intervention

As previously indicated, the purpose of this strategy is to design, implement and evaluate an approach for disseminating selected ITCP instructional systems into IGE and FTC schools by providing training in the Midwest IGE network and FTC network. To collect the needed information, the following three interrelated investigations will be conducted. Each of these investigations are a part of the larger design being presented in this document. They are reported here as separate activities to emphasize correspondence to distinct evaluation questions. Appendices A and B outline in greater detail the sequence of activities for each evaluation investigation, data sources, means of data collection and analysis suggestions

The first study, a context evaluation, is designed to provide information on the feasibility of the strategy based upon initial implementation efforts. Specifically, one purpose of this investigation is to describe and make judgments regarding the needs, problems and opportunities of collaborative efforts such as these. The second purpose is to obtain judgments as to the generalizability of this approach to

other networks. Descriptions and judgments regarding needs, problems, and opportunities will be obtained by the following means: (1) review of written documentation, (2) informal interviews with FRDWU staff, and (3) a questionnaire for organizers of training sessions. Judgments regarding generalizability will be obtained by identifying a small number of persons familiar with networks nationally and asking for their opinions.[12]

The third purpose of this study is to determine the degree to which the dissemination objectives have been achieved. Assessment will consider short and long-term effects. One short-term assessment point will occur as close to the end of this funding cycle as possible. The means of data collection is a review of the Contact Report Forms which includes a tracer system of additional communication between the Technical Assistance Unit and anyone who was involved in the IGE/FTC dissemination strategy.[13] Another short-term assessment point will occur following each training session when participants will be asked about their intentions to train others, to participate in additional training, etc. A description of the types of additional communication that occurs and numbers involved as well as a description of participants' intentions will be the only indicators of achievement of the dissemination objectives during this funding cycle.

The long-term estimates of achievement will include: (1) a review of the Contact Report Forms up until September 1977, (2) a followup questionnaire to participants requesting information on actual rather

---

[12]A small group of 5-8: Possible members are Kathleen DeVaney, Director of the National Teachers' Centers Network, Staff of the Local Problem Solving unit at NIE and David Crandall of the National Diffusion Network.

[13]This design is delineated in *Evaluation Design for the Establishment of a Technical Assistance Unit in the Improving Teaching Competencies Program.* May 1976.

than intended training of others, additional training for self, etc., and (3) an analysis of a log which participants will be asked to keep on their training efforts and problems that occur.

The second study will focus on understanding the factors that influence the feasiblity. Four categories of factors have been identified that could influence the degree to which the dissemination objectives are achieved, i.e., participants themselves, the schools, the instructional systems, and the actual training received. A short-term and long-term study of these factors is proposed. The short-term emphasis that will be completed before the end of the funding cycle is on the quality of the actual training received. One purpose of this short-term study is to determine if the training was as effective as previous training in the same instructional systems. This information will tell us if we need to continue further study of the effects of the training sessions themselves or the achievement of the dissemination objectives. Standards from previous evaluations of similar systems will be used to make judgments regarding the quality of the training received. Two means of data collection will feed into this process: (1) an evaluator-observer will be present at each training session and will make judgments as to the overall quality and the degree of deviation from established procedures, and (2) a participant questionnaire will request perceptions of quality. Another purpose of this short-term investigation is to assess the quality of the newly developed set of activities designed to instruct participants on means of adapting materials, and to create awareness of other available ITCP systems. Similar means of data collection will feed into making these judgments; however, the availability of relative standard is impossible since this is the first time these materials will be used.

The long-term study will include an initial assessment of the effects of the participants, conditions in schools and the instructional systems themselves on the achievement of proposed dissemination objectives. The primary means of data collection will include: (1) followup questionnaire of participants, (2) analysis of log notation participants will be asked to maintain on their training, adaptation and associated problems, and (3) review of Contact Record Forms over the past year, 9/1/76 - 9/1/77.

Regional Workshop Intervention

As previously indicated, the purpose of this strategy is to develop, implement and evaluate an approach for disseminating selected ITCP instructional systems, e.g., offering a series of Regional Workshops to individuals. To collect the needed information, the following three interrelated investigations will be conducted. Each of these investigations is a part of the larger design being presented in this document. They are reported here to emphasize correspondence to distinct evaluation questions. Appendices A and B outline in greater detail the sequence of activities for each evaluation investigation, data sources, means of data collection and analysis suggestions.

The first study, a context evaluation, is designed to provide information on the feasibility of this strategy based upon initial implementation efforts. Specifically, one purpose of this investigation is to describe and make judgments regarding the needs, problems and opportunities of conducting Regional Workshops. This study will include an analysis of the planning and structuring decisions made in regard to the workshops, the degree of compatibility of resules from the initial implementation efforts with those projected in Rath (1975), and an

understanding of the characteristics of participants who received training. Means of data collection include: (1) informal interviews with FRLWU staff, (2) review of documents, and (3) Participant Background Information Questionnaire. Another purpose of this investigation is to analyze other institutions' use of the regional workshop concept. The means of data collection for this aspect of the context evaluation include: (1) information telephone interviews, (2) literature search, and (3) review of documents, e.g., evaluations sent by personnel from other institutions. The final purpose of the context evaluation is to assess the degree to which dissemination objectives have been achieved. Short-term indicators of achievement will be collected before the end of this funding cycle. The means of data collection that will be used in making this judgment include: (1) a review of the Contact Record Forms that trace continued communication between the Technical Assistance Unit and regional workshop participants and (2) results from participant questionnaire on itmes relating to intentions to train others, receive additional training themselves, etc.

Long-term indicators of achievement will include: (1) a review of the Contact Report Forms up until September 1977 and (2) results from a participant followup questionnaire requesting information on actual rather than intended efforts in training others or receiving additional training themselves.

The second study is a product evaluation to determine if the Regional Workshop training was as effective as previous training in the same instructional systems. This information will tell us if we need to continue further study of the influence of the training sessions themselves on the achievement of the dissemination objectives. Standards from previous evaluations of similar systems will be used to make

judgments regarding the quality of the training received. Two means of data collection will feed into this process: (1) an evaluator-observer will be present at each training session and will make judgments as to the overall quality and the degree of deviation from established procedures, and (2) a participant questionnaire on perceptions of quality.

The third study examines factors that influence the feasibility of offering Regional Workshops. This study differs from the study on factors proposed for the IGE/FTC intervention. In the former study, the focus is on a greater understanding of the variables that influence whether the dissemination objectives are achieved. In this study, the focus is on greater understanding of factors that influence the feasibility of recruiting persons for Regional Workshops rather than looking at the effects of this strategy in terms of achievement of dissemination objectives. Four variables which could have been influenctial have been selected for study, i.e., location, time, content, and cost. The primary means of data collection for this study will be a telephone interview with a stratified random sample[14] of persons who were sent brochures describing the workshop but chose not to attend.

---

[14]Actual numbers and sampling procedures will be dependent upon total numbers of brochures sent out as well as the number and location of workshops cancelled because of an insufficient amount of participants.

REPORTING PROCEDURES

The information generated as a product of this evaluation will be summarized in three major reports and a series of minor documents. Expected completion dates for major reports are as follows:

1. Interim Evaluation Report on the IGE and FTC network intervention to be completed by November 30, 1976. This report will include the following information:

    a. Results of the context evaluation

    b. Results of the short-range study on the achievement of dissemination objectives

    c. Results of the effects of the training sessions themselves

2. Final Evaluation Report on the IGE and FTC network intervention to be completed by November 30, 1977. This report[15] will include the following information:

    a. Results of the long-range study on the achievement of dissemination objectives

    b. Results of the long-range study examining variables influencing achievement of dissemination objectives

3. Interim Evaluation Report on the Regional Workshop intervention to be completed by November 30, 1976. This report will include the following information:

    a. Results of the context evaluation

    b. Results of the short-range study on the achievement of dissemination objectives

    c. Results of the effects of the training sessions themselves

    d. Results of study examining reasons for decisions not to attend workshops offered

4. Final Evaluation Report on the Regional Workshop intervention to be completed by November 30, 1977. This report[15] will include the following information:

    a. Results of the long-range study on the achievement of the dissemination objectives

---

[15]Reports 2 and 4 are dependent upon securing additional funds beyond November 1976.

Appendix A:

Worksheets for the Evaluation

Worksheet For The Evaluation
IGE/FTC Network Intervention

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
I. Questions related to strategy feasibility - Context Evaluation Study: (a) generalizability 1. To what degree do the IGE and Florida Teacher Centers serve as a good example of networks to be tapped for use? 2. To what extent are there a number of similar networks available in which the dissemination strategy can be tested? 3. How are characteristics of this network similar to others?	Expert opinion	-Informal Telephone Interviews	by 9/1/76	Descriptive summaries of interviews; including judgments of generalizability and lists of networks identified. Preparation of minor document on results. Summary presented in report 11/30/76.
(b) needs, problems and opportunities of this effort 4. What are the antecedents and transactions involved in developing and implementing these collaborative relationships? 5. What factors inhibit collaborative efforts such as these?	FRDMU Staff IGE Staff FTC Directors Workshop participants	-Informal interviews with NWRL Staff -Workshop Organizer Questionnaire (Appendix D Items 1-14) -Review of written documents used in planning -Participant Background Information Sheet (Appendix F Items 1-12)	by 10/1/76 by 10/1/76 by 10/1/76 by 10/1/76	Descriptions of antecedents and transactions; listings of needs, problems and opportunities identified and frequencies Descriptions of participants and organizers on dimensions such as previous experience with lab products, roles in schools Preparation of minor document of above activities. Summary presented in report 11/30/76.

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
6. What are the crucial elements of a successful collaboration effort of this nature?				
7. What are the "spin offs" from these efforts?				
8. To what degree would personnel from both institutions actively seek other collaborative arrangements?				
9. To what degree are prior working relationships a necessary ingredient to entry into networks?				
10. What are the characteristics of participants and organizers?				
(c) degree to which dissemination objectives have been achieved Short-range	FRDMU Professional and Clerical Staff	-Analysis of Contact Record Forms	by 11/1/76	Tabulation of types and frequencies of additional communication between lab staff and workshop participants.
11. To what degree are participants more knowledgeable about lab products as a result of their involvement?	Workshop participants	-Post session Participant Questionnaire (Appendix H Items I-3, 4-III, 1,2)	by 10/1/76	Descriptions and frequency of participant's intentions regarding training others or receiving additional training, etc. Preparation of minor document on results - summary

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
12. To what degree is there greater use of lab products in IGE and Teacher Center schools which can be traced to involvement in these sessions either directly or indirectly?				of results presented in report 11/30/76.
13. To what degree did persons trained, train others?				
14. To what degree did training in these products lead to future training by same participants in other products?				
15. To what degree are products sold?				
Long-range: same objectives 11-15	Workshop Participants	-Follow up Questionnaire (Appendix J)	by 10/1/77	Tables and figures representing percentages of responses for various items.
		-Log Analysis (Appendix K)	by 10/1/77	Content analysis of entries in log. Descriptions and frequencies of reoccurring problems and issues.
		-Analysis of Contact Record Forms	by 10/1/77	Listing of types and frequencies of additional communication between staff and workshop participants. Full description of study and results in final report 11/30/77.

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
II. Questions relating to variables which may affect feasibility of achieving dissemination objectives: Long-range Study: (a) Characteristics of participants 16. To what degree are participants in positions to advise or influence budget allocation? 17. To what degree do participants have job responsibilities which include identification of needs and products which address these needs? Does job include influencing others in this regard? 18. To what extent are participants influential in their school context? 19. To what degree are participants committed to planned change as a means of problem solving? 20. To what extent do participants have as high priority problems which lab products address?	Workshop Participants	-Participant Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix J) -Written notations in log (Appendix K) -Review of results of Contact Record Forms	by 10/1/77 by 10/1/77 by 10/1/77	Tables and figures displaying percentages of responses for various items; content analysis of log entries; listings of types of additional communication specific to this category of variables, results described in final report 11/30/77.

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
21. To what degree do participants come to sessions with or without previous exposure to lab products?				
22. In what ways does the team approach provide additional incentive for use of products when return to jobs?				
23. Can participants be released to conduct training?				
(b) Characteristics of schools	Workshop Participants	-Participant Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix J Items)	by 10/1/77	Tables and figures displaying percentages of responses for various items; content analysis of log entries; listings of types of additional communication specific to this category of variable,s results described in final report 11/30/77.
24. In what ways do budget problems prevent utilization of any products which have cost requirements?		-Written notations in log	by 10/1/77	
25. To what extent do budget limitations rule out lab product selection?		-Review of results of Contact Record Forms	by 10/1/77	
26. In what ways do IGE or FTC developed processes and products compete for limited resources? What were the critical competitors for limited dollars?				

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
27. What is the degree to which IGE and FTC schools have perceived needs which lab products address?				
28. In what ways do IGE and Teacher Center schools have mechanisms for staff development which hinder or facilitate use of products and required training?				
(c) Characteristics of systems	Workshop Participants	-Participant Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix J Items	by 10/1/77	Tables and figures displaying percentages of responses for various items; content analysis of log entries; listings of types of additional communication specific to this category of variable,s results described in final report 11/30/77.
29. To what degree is a compatible philosophy of products and networks a necessary prerequisite?		-Written notations in log	by 10/1/77	
30. To what degree are requirements for lab product use (ex. trainer training) a hinderance or asset to use in networks?		-Review of results of Contact Record Forms	by 10/1/77	

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
Short-range Study:				
(a) Characteristics of training received 31. What is the rationale behind training format, selection of products used, and time allocation? 32. To what degree are the objectives for the sessions accomplished? 33. To what degree are the sessions well organized and delivery effective? 34. To what degree are accommodations conducive to effective training?	Workshop participants Lab/IGE Trainers On-site evaluator	-Workshop Trainer Questionnaire (Appendix E Items 1-7) -Post-session Participant Questionnaire (Appendix H Items II 1-5) -Workshop Trainer Observation Sheet (Appendix G •Items 1-10) -Review of Artifacts of training (objectives, descriptions of events)	by 10/1/76 by 10/15/76 by 10/1/76 by 10/1/76	Tables and charts showing distribution of responses over categories - comparisons of results from this training to other training in the systems; descriptions of deviations - comparisons of amount of deviation with other training.
FOR IGE ONLY 35. In what ways will choice of options affect degree to which objectives are achieved? 36. Is the two and one-half day design an effective way to provide instruction on adaptation?	Workshop participants Lab/IGE Trainers On-site evaluator	-Post-session Participant Questionnaire (IGE only) (Appendix I Items 1-10) -Review of artifacts of training (objectives description of events)	by 11/1/76 by 10/1/76	Tables and charts showing distribution of responses over categories; descriptions of deviations from formats and summary of suggestions for improvements.

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
37. To what degree is the micro-lab an effective way to communicate information on other lab products?		-Workshop trainer Observation Sheet (Appendix G Items 1-10)	by 10/1/76	Minor document prepared for above results; summary provided in report 11/30/76.

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
I. Questions relating to the feasibility of this strategy as a means of dissemination/diffusion of ITCP instructional systems				
(a) What are the needs, problems and opportunities in conducting regional workshops such as these?	FRDMU Staff	-Informal Interviews with Staff -Review of planning documents -Participants Background Information Sheet (Appendix F Items 1-9 and 13)	by 9/1/76 by 9/1/76 by 9/1/76	Descriptions of antecedents and transactions; listings of needs, problems and opportunities and frequencies; descriptions of characteristics of participants.
1. What are the antecedents and transactions involved in developing and implementing the regional workshop interventions?				
2. What rationale is presented for implementing decisions regarding promotion, time, location, content and cost for participants?				
3. In what ways do the outcomes of this endeavor support or reject the previous planning work on the regional workshops concept?				
4. What are the characteristics of participants, in terms of role, previous experience with ITCP programs, degree to which they personally paid for training?				
5. To what degree was location, time, content, and cost a factor in participants' decisions to attend?				

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
6. What can be learned from other institutions such as the National Training Laboratory and the American Education Research Association regarding recruitment and selection of participants, location, time, cost, and content of training? 7. What is the degree to which the content and context of other institution's use of regional workshop comparable to NWRL's endeavors?	Key personnel from other institutions, e.g., NTL, AERA	-Informal telephone interviews -Literature search -Review of documentation, e.g., evaluation reports sent by other workshop users	by 9/1/76	Summary statements on how other institutions use regional workshop concept and what is learned from their efforts. Minor document prepared; summary provided in 11/30/76 report.
(b) Degree to which dissemination objectives are achieved. Short-Range 8. What is the nature of further training in other packages by participants at workshops? 9. To what degree do participants "train" others in product use? 10. To what degree do agencies or individuals receive information on Lab products which can be traced to participant involvement in workshops either directly or indirectly? 11. To what degree are products and/or services sold to individuals or organizations as a result of holding workshops?	FRDMU Professional and Clerical Staff Workshop Participants	-Analysis of Contact Record Forms -Post-session Participant Questionnaire (Appendix H Items I-3, 4 III-1,2)	by 11/1/76 by 10/15/76	Tabulations of types and frequencies of additional communication between lab staff and workshop participants; Descriptions/ percents of participant intentions regarding training others, etc. Summary of results in 11/30/76 report.

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
Long-Range: Same objectives 8-11	Workshop participants	-Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix J) -Analysis of Contact Record Forms	by 10/1/77 by 10/1/77	Tables and figures showing percentages of responses for various items; listing of types and figures of additional communication. Descriptions of results in report by 11/30/76.
II. Questions Relating to the degree to which workshops were effectively implemented as planned.				
12. Was the session well organized and delivery effective?	Workshop participants Lab Trainers On-Site Evaluator	-Workshop trainer Questionnaire (Appendix E Items 1-7) -Post-session Participant Questionnaire (Appendix H Items II-1-5) -Review of artifacts of training (objectives, description of events)	by 9/1/76 by 9/1/76 by 9/1/76	Tables and charts showing distribution of responses over categories - comparisons of results from this training to other training in same system; descriptions of deviations - comparison of amount of deviation with other training. Document prepared and summarized in report 11/30/76.
13. What is the degree to which accommodations were conducive to effective training?				
14. What is the degree to which training objectives were accomplished?				

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Info. Is Collected	Analysis and Reporting Procedures
III. Questions relating to understanding of various aspects which affect decision to attend. 15. To what degree does the location of the workshop affect decision? 16. To what degree does the time of the workshop affect decision? 17. To what degree does the content of the session affect decision? 18. To what degree does cost (tuition, travel, lodging) affect decision?	Random sample of persons sent brochures	Follow-up telephone interviews	by 9/15/76	Frequency distributions of times each factor was cited. Estimates of importance of each factor. Minor document describing study and presenting results. Summary of finding in report 11/30/76.

Appendix B

Planned Time Sequence and Staffing

APPENDIX B

PLANNED TIME SCHEDULE AND STAFF ALLOCATION FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES FOR IGE/FTC AND REGIONAL WORKSHOP STRATEGIES

*Optional within funding cycle
#Projected beyond November 30, 1976

ACTIVITY	Beginning Date	Completion Date	Days Per Month During Current Funding Cycle								Days Per Month Projected Beyond Current Funding Cycle											
			A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N
1. Design evaluation study and instrument drafts	4/1/76	5/15/76	5	5																		
2. Secure ITCP, NWRL, NIE approval of design	5/15/76	6/1/76			3																	
3. Refine instrumentation	7/1/76	7/15/76				5																
IGE/FTC Design																						
4. Context Evaluation																						
*a. Generalizability concerns	7/1/76	9/1/76				2	3															
b. Needs, problems, opportunities	7/1/76	10/1/76					2	6	3	3												
c. Dissemination objectives achievement																						
(1) Short-range	8/1/76	11/30/76						2	5	5												
#(2) Long-range	12/1/76	11/30/77									5	5	5	2	2	2	5	5	5	10	10	10
5. Variables affecting achievement of dissemination objectives																						
#a. Characteristics of participants	12/1/76	11/30/77									5	5	5	2	2	2	5	5	5	5	20	20
#b. Characteristics of Schools																						
#c. Characteristics of instructional systems																						
d. Characteristics of training received	7/1/76	10/1/76				5	20[1]	5	10	5												
Regional Workshop Design																						
6. Context Evaluation																						
a. Needs, problems, opportunities	7/1/76	9/1/76				3	4	2	2	1												
*b. Other institution review of use of regional workshops	7/1/76	9/1/76					2	2		2												
c. Degree of achievement of dissemination objectives																						
(1) Short-range	7/1/76	11/30/76						2	3	3												
#(2) Long-range	12/1/76	11/30/77									3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	5	5	
7. Effectiveness of training received study[2]	7/1/76	11/30/76				10	5	5	2	2												
8. Study relating to understanding decisions to attend or not	7/1/76	11/1/76				5	2	6	6	2												

[1]May be less if decision is made not to have an on-site evaluator

[2]Allocation depends upon number of sessions offered

Appendix C:

Descriptions of ITCP Instructional System Used in Training

Title: Interpersonal Communications (IPC)

Intended Users

Primarily, Interpersonal Communications has been designed for the following role groups: teachers, administrators, supervisory and coordinating personnel, and preservice education students. The instructional system can also be used with high school students and parent groups.

Main Emphases

Interpersonal Communications is an experiential instructional system. It provides (a) information about the process of communication, (b) opportunities for participants to increase their interpersonal communication skills and (c) experiences for understanding one's own styles of communication.

Intents/Contents

An Interpersonal Communications workshop provides participants with knowledge and skills generally applicable to:

1. Face-to-face communication
2. Individual styles of communicating
3. Group and organizational factors which affect communication
4. Continued improvement of one's communication skills

During the workshop, exercises include: (a) paraphrasing, (b) behavior description, (c) describing feelings, (d) nonverbal communication, (e) the concept of feedback, (f) matching behavior with intentions, (g) communicating under pressure and (h) communication patterns in the school building.

Main Activities

There are 20 instructional sessions that comprise an IPC workshop. Each session involves the participants in practicing communication behaviors, learning ways to recognize these behaviors, and receiving feedback concerning their use. The system includes films, theory papers, written exercises, observation activities, and self-evaluative guides.

Provisions for use

A. Format: Workshop

B. Personnel Required:

One experienced trainer or a team of qualified trainers for 12-36 participants (materials provided for multiples of 6).

C. Product Components:

Required: 1 trainer's manual per trainer
1 set of participant materials per participant
9 16 mm films
1 audiotape

Optional: Field Test and Outcome Milestone Report for Interpersonal Communications (1974)

Summary of Interpersonal Communications Field Test and Outcome Milestone Report (1975)

D. Other Resources:

1 film projector
1 tape recorder

Newsprint, felt pens, masking tape
A large room (preferably carpeted) with movable tables and comfortable chairs
Beverages and refreshments in the room

E. Related Products:

This program is related to Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving, Research Utilizing Problem Solving, Interpersonal Influence, Preparing Educational Training Consultants I, II and III.

F. Time Span:

There are 20 sessions which require approximately 30 hours to complete. Whenever possible training should be covered in five consecutive days or two sessions of 2 ½ days held within two weeks.

Conditions of Use

Although there are no prerequisites, participants must be present for every session of the workshop since the exercises are sequential and cumulative.

Cost Range

Leader's Manual: Interpersonal Communications (396 pages, loose leaf and three-hole punched) $19.95 each

Participant Materials (342 pages, loose leaf and three-hole punched) $12.95 per set

By Charles Jung, Rosalie Howard, Ruth Emory and René Pino

Audiovisual Instructional Materials
$275.00 per set of nine 16mm sound films and one audiotape

Above prices plus shipping charges

Optional evaluation reports are available for $5.00 each

Client groups must consider

1. Cost for trainers, 5 days
   plus travel expenses and per diem

2. Release time for participants, 5 days

Adaptability

Easily adapted by qualified trainers to meet the needs of users other than educational personnel and to fit into differing time constraints.

Product Availability

Training Materials: Xicom, Inc.
RFD 1, Sterling Forest
Tuxedo, New York 10987

Evaluation Reports: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Dr. John Lohman, Program Director

For Additional Information Contact

Dr. William T. Ward
Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

(503) 248-6868

Title: Interpersonal Influence (INF)

Intended Users

Primarily, Interpersonal Influence has been designed for the following role groups: teachers, administrators, supervisory and coordinating personnel, and preservice education students. The instructional system can also be used with high school students and parent groups.

Main Emphases

Interpersonal Influence is an experiential system which provides (a) information about the basic concepts of influence processes, (b) opportunities for participants to practice influence skills and to identify their characteristic styles of interpersonal influence.

Intents/Contents

The activities in this instructional system are designed to provide the following competencies:

Ability to identify and explain the major ideas that describe the processes of interpersonal influence

Capability for using guidelines provided to diagnose and analyze forces and effects of influence in selected interpersonal and group situations

Ability to identify and make judgments about one's characteristic influence styles

Ability to identify extent and nature of one's own need to influence

Capability for identifying ways in which principles learned and guidelines utilized in the workshop may be applied in settings other than the workshop

Main Activities

There are 20 instructional sessions in an Interpersonal Influence workshop. During the workshop, participants experience a variety of ways in which they may learn about interpersonal influence. There are written definitions, descriptions, some films and tape recordings to illustrate behaviors of present dilemmas. There are times for reflecting on experiences and ways of doing things; times for discussing ideas; techniques for observing and analyzing behavior. There are opportunites to share observations with others and to ask for observations and reactions. There are some simulation, task performance and role playing situations in which participants can try out behaviors.

Provisions for Use

A. Format: Workshop

B. Personnel Required:

One experienced trainer per 12-36 participants

C. Product Components:

Required: 1 trainer's manual per trainer
1 set of participant materials per participant
9 16 mm films
1 audiotape

Optional: Followup Survey of Interpersonal Influence Interim Field Test Participants (1974)

Interpersonal Influence Interim Evaluation Report (1974)

Summary of Interpersonal Influence Interim Field Test and Followup Survey (1975)

Interpersonal Influence Final Evaluation Report Report (1976)

Summary Report of Interpersonal Influence Field Test, Impact Study and Expert Review (1976)

D. Other Resources

1 film projector
1 tape recorder
Newsprint, felt pens, masking tape
A large room (preferably carpeted) with movable tables and comfortable chairs
Beverages and refreshments in the room

E. Related Products:

This program is related to Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving, Research Utilizing Problem Solving, Interpersonal Communications, Preparing Educational Training Consultants I, II and III.

F. Time Span:

The 20 sessions require approximately 30 hours to complete. Whenever possible training should be covered in five consecutive days or two sessions of 2 ½ days held within two weeks

Conditions of Use

Although there are no prerequisites for this training, participants must be present for every session of the workshop since the exercises are sequential and cumulative.

Cost Range

Leader's Manual: Interpersonal Influence (207 pages, loose leaf and three-hole punched) $19.95 each

Participant Materials (185 pages, loose leaf and three-hole punched) $12.95 per set

By Ruth Emory and René Pino

Audiovisual Instructional Materials
$240.00 per set of four 16mm sound films and two audiotapes

Above prices plus shipping charges

Optional evaluation reports are available for $5.00 each.

Client groups must consider:

1. Cost for trainers, 5 days plus travel expenses and per diem
2. Release time for participants, 5 days

Adaptability

The printed materials are easily adapted by qualified trainers to meet the needs of users other than educational personnel and to fit into differing time arrangments.

Product Availability

Training Materials: Xicom, Inc.
RFD 1, Sterling Forest
Tuxedo, New York 10987

Evaluation Reports: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Dr. John Lohman, Program Director

For Additonal Information Contact

Dr. William T. Ward
Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

(503) 248-6868

Title: Group Process Skills (GPS)

A skills training workshop

Intended Users

GPS has been designed for the following role groups: teachers, administrators, supervisory and coordinating personnel, and students in teacher preparation.

Main Emphases

The materials used in a Group Process Skills (GPS) workshop have been designed to help participants become more effective members of the organizations to which they belong. The materials emphasize such process skills as communication techniques, problem solving, decision making and goal identification.

Intents/Contents

The Group Process Skills (GPS) program has been developed to provide participants with the opportunities to:

Assess existing and potential problems within an organizational subgroup of which they are a part

Identify small group process skills which they, as an individual, need to improve

Increase their experience with these skills by participation in exercises chosen by the trainers

Integrate learnings for application in their backhome setting

Main Activities

As a group works through the materials under the guidance of the trainer, data is gathered on the group's makeup and use of process skills.

Participants gather much of this data themselves and learn to analyze it. Meanwhile, the trainers use the data to help them diagnose skill needs as well as to select and sequence exercises especially designed to speak to such needs.

Provisions for Use

A. Format: Workshop

B. Personnel Required:

Two experienced trainers per 12-36 participants

C. Product Components:

1 set of instructional strategies for GPS per trainer
1 set of collection of exercises per trainer
1 set of participant materials per GPS participant
Multiple copies of exercises per workshop

D. Other Resources:

Newsprint, felt pens, masking tape, name tags
A large room (preferably carpeted) with movable tables and comfortable chairs
Beverages and refreshments in the room

E. Related Products:

GPS is used as the practicum for Preparing Educational Training Consultants I (PETC-I), a training system designed to prepare individuals to function as "skills trainers."

F. Time Span:

GPS requires approximately 33 hours of training. Whenever possible, training should be covered in five consecutive days.

Conditions of Use

Although there are no prerequisites for this training, participants must be present for every session of the workshop since the exercises are sequential and cumulative.

Cost Range

Collection of Exercises ($31.00)
GPS Instructional Strategies ($6.80)
GPS Participant Materials ($5.90)
Duplicating options for multiple copies of exercise handouts
1 set of 138 camera-ready exercise handouts ($11.00)
12 sets of all exercise handouts ($64.00)
12 copies of a single exercise handout ($.50)

Client groups must consider:

1. Cost for trainers, 5 days plus travel expenses and per diem
2. Release time for participants, 5 days

Adaptability

This training system is easily adaptable by qualified trainers to meet the needs of users other than educational personnel and to fit into differing time constraints.

Product Availability

Commercial-Educational Distributing Services (CEDS)
P. O. Box 3711
Portland, Oregon 97208

For Additional Information Contact:

Dr. William T. Ward
Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

(503) 248-6868

Title: Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Skills Training (PETC-I)

First of the three-part PETC series.

Intended Users

This training system is designed for educators at any level who wish to acquire trainer and consultant skills.

Main Emphases

PETC-I is an experiential instructional system which provides training in such process skills as goal settting, problem solving, communicating, influencing and decision making. The focus of a PETC-I workshop is to prepare participants to function as skills trainers and to conduct group process skills (GPS) workshops.

Intents/Contents

The general goal of PETC-I is to teach participants to train others in process skills and to facilitate the functioning of small groups. During this process, skills trainers are prepared to:

1. Assess issues and problems within a small group
2. Diagnose skill needs of individuals within the group
3. Identify group priorities for skills training exercises
4. Apply criteria for selecting and sequencing skills training exercises
5. Adapt and conduct skills training exercises
6. Evaluate acquisition of skills

Main Activities

The PETC-I system is a two part workshop. The first part of the program consists of a one week training program during which the PETC-I trainees (skills trainers) study the basic concepts of the instructional system. Also during the first week, the skills trainers are provided with a series of exercises to practice group skills training.

The second part of the workshop is a practicum for the skills trainers. During the practicum the skills trainers form trios; each trio works with a second group of 12 to 24 people. This second training week is referred to as the Group Process Skills (GPS) workshop, and the second set of participants are called GPS trainees. These sessions, which are conducted over a 5-day period, are designed so GPS trainees can obtain training in group process skills from the trio of skills trainers. The techniques and strategies of group process exercises are applicable to any group for whom the materials are new.

Provisions for Use

A. Format: Two-Part Workshop

Part I prepares skills trainers to conduct group process skills exercises

Part II (GPS workshop) allows skills trainers to practice while they conduct a workshop for others in group process skills

B. Personnel Required:

One senior trainer who has completed prerequisites including Interpersonal Communications and Research Utilizing Problem Solving or has had comparable training experience

Parts I and II: Twelve to eighteen skills trainers, materials have been prepared for multiples of three

Part II: Twelve to twenty-four GPS participants per trio of skills trainers

C. Product Components:

Required: Part I: Skills Training

1 set of instructional strategies per senior trainer
1 set of participant materials per skills trainer
1 set of collection of exercises per senior and skills trainer
Multiple copies of exercises per workshop

Part II: Group Process Skills Practicum

1 set of instructional strategies for GPS per skills trainer
1 set of participant materials per GPS participant
Multiple copies of exercises per workshop

Optional: Field Test Technical Report for Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Skills Training (PETC-I) (1975)

Outcome Evaluation Report for Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Skills Training (PETC-I) (1976)

D. Other Resources:

Part I: Spacious room with movable and comfortable furniture; chairs and tables for small groups

Part II: A similar room for each team of skills trainers as well as a general meeting room for conferences and access to exercise materials

Facilities for both sessions should be located near refreshment facilities.

Both sessions: Newsprint, felt pens, masking tape, name tags, art supplies

E. Related Products:

This program is related to Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving, Research Utilizing Problem Solving, Interpersonal Communications, Interpersonal Influence, PETC-II and PETC-III.

F. Time Span:

Two weeks are required for skills trainers, five consecutive days for Part I and either five consecutive days or two 2 ½ day sessions for Part II.

Part II, the GPS workshop, requires one week of GPS participant time.

Conditions of Use

Prerequisites for PETC-I skills trainers include Interpersonal Communications and Research Utilizing Problem Solving or comparable experience. There are no prerequisites for GPS participants.

Because this training is cumulative, participants must be present for every session of the workshop.

Cost Range

Part I: Skills Training

1 set of instructional strategies per senior trainer ($8.90)
1 set of collection of exercises per senior and skills trainer ($31.00)
1 set of participant materials per skills trainer ($6.85)
Multiple copies of exercise handouts

Part II: Group Process Skills (GPS) Practicum

1 set of GPS instructional strategies per skills trainer ($6.80)
1 set of GPS participant materials per GPS participant ($5.90)
Duplicating options for multiple copies of exercise handouts
1 set of 138 camera-ready exercise handouts ($11.00)
12 sets of all exercise handouts ($64.00)
12 copies of a single exercise handout ($.50)

Optional evaluation reports are available for $5.00 each.

Adaptability

Product Availability

Training Materials: Commercial Educational Distributing Services
P. O. Box 3711
Portland, Oregon 97208

Evaluation Reports: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Dr. John Lohman, Program Director

For Additional Information Contact

Dr. William T. Ward
Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

(503) 248-6868

Appendix D:

Workshop Organizer Questionnaire

WORKSHOP ORGANIZER QUESTIONNAIRE

Data Sources

IGE Installers
Florida Teacher Center Directors

Name_____

Sex: Male_____ Female_____

Date of Workshop_____

1. What is your current occupation or job position?_____

_____

2. How many years of previous work experience have you had?_____

3. What is your educational background?

_____Some college (major)_____
_____College graduate (major)_____
_____Graduate student (major)_____
_____Advanced degrees (major)_____

4. How would you characterize your experience in attracting prospective participants to this workshop? (e.g., difficulties, etc.)

5. What criteria were used in the selection of participants?

6. How would you characterize your experience in setting up this workshop program? (e.g., in terms of timelines, flexibility of design, etc.)

7. Have you ever organized this workshop program before?

Yes___ If so, how many times?_____

No____

8. Did you encounter the same or different types of problems?

9. Have you ever run other similar workshop programs? (e.g., Facilitating Inquiry in the Classroom, RUPS, PETC-I, etc.)

Yes_____ If so, which ones?_____

No_____

10. Have you ever been a participant in this workshop program?

Yes_____

No_____

11. Have you ever been a participant in any other similar workshop programs?

Yes_____

No_____

12. What suggestions can you make for organizing future workshops of this nature?

13. What are the benefits of conducting workshops such as these?

14. Would you participate in organizing future workshops such as these? What would be the nature of the involvement?

Appendix E:

Workshop Trainer Questionnaire

WORKSHOP TRAINER QUESTIONNAIRE

Data Sources

ITCP Trainers
IGE Trainers

Name:_____

Sex: Male_____Female_____

Date of Workshop_____

1. Have you ever led this workshop program before?

   No_____ Yes _____ If so, how many times?_____

   How long ago?_____ As a trainer or cotrainer?_____

2. Have you ever led other similar workshop programs? (e.g., Facilitating Inquiry in the Classroom, RUPS, PETC-I, etc.)

   No_____ Yes _____ If so, which ones?_____

   How long ago?_____ As a trainer or cotrainer?_____

3. What is the degree to which participants in these sessions were similar to or different from other groups you have trained?

4. Have you ever been a participant in this workshop program?

   Yes_____ No_____

5. Have you ever been a participant in other similar workshop programs?

   Yes_____ No_____

6. The resource materials in this workshop program appear:

Too structured, blocks learning	/___/___/___/___/___/___/	Structure useful, promotes learning
Sufficient to meet the workshop training needs	/___/___/___/___/___/___/	Insufficient to meet the training needs
Difficult to administer and manage	/___/___/___/___/___/___/	Easy to administer and manage
Interesting for participants	/___/___/___/___/___/___/	Boring for participants

WORKSHOP TRAINER QUESTIONNAIRE

Difficult for participants	/__/__/__/__/__/__/	Easy for participants
Worthwhile for participants	/__/__/__/__/__/__/	Not worthwhile for participants

6. How do you feel about the role required of the trainer by this program?

Very uncomfortable	/__/__/__/__/__/__/	Very comfortable

7. Describe deviations from proposed format and reaons for the change?

Appendix F:

Participant Background Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

Data Sources

Participants

Name:_____

Date of Workshop:_____

Location_____

Sex: Male_____ Female_____

1. What is your current occupation or job position?_____

_____

2. How many years of previous work experience have you had?_____

3. What is your educational background?

_____Some college (major)_____
_____College graduate (major)_____
_____Graduate student (major)_____
_____Advanced degrees (major)_____

4. Have you ever been involved in any of the following kinds of workshops or courses?

_____Interpersonal Influence
_____Facilitating Inquiry in the Classroom
_____Flanders' Interaction Analysis
_____Problem Solving
_____Courses in Human Relations or Group Dynamics
(How Long?)_____
_____Other related courses (How long?)_____
_____Human Relations (t-groups, Gestalt encounter groups, marathons, sensitivity training)
_____Other related workshops (What?)_____
(How long?)_____

5. People attend workshops for a variety of reasons. Please check honestly any of the following reaons that apply to you, and circle the checkmark of the reasons which is most important in your decision to attend.

_____It satisfies a requirement or gives me credits I need
_____Many others in my school were attending
_____My superiors suggested I go
_____My superiors gave me the opportunity to go
_____I was selected to attend
_____My attendance was paid for
_____I came because I really wanted to learn
_____I'd heard_____
_____I had a particular problem to solve or deal with and thought this training would help me
_____Other (What?)_____

6. What do you expect will happen at this workshop?

7. What do you expect to gain as a result?

8. Does your attendance at this workshop contribute towards:

Yes	No	
___	___	State certification
___	___	Credit toward academic degrees
___	___	School district tenure
___	___	Salary schedule criteria
___	___	Other (explain)_____

_____

_____

9. Do you feel attendance at this workshop <u>should</u> contribute to any of the above listed in Question 8?

No_____

Yes_____ Which?_____

10. (For IGE and FTC only) Describe your involvement in IGE/Teacher Center Schools. What role(s) do you serve?

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. (For IGE and FTC only) What are the major problems in IGE/Teacher Center schools.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. (For IGE only) Which of the following options have you selected?

_____Attend first week session IPC only

_____Attend first and second week session IPC and PETC-I

_____Attend three week session

_____Attend second and third week session

_____Other

What factors influenced the selection of your option?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. (For Regional Workshops) Please indicate the degree to which four factors influenced your decision to attend this workshop.

A. Location_____

_____

B. Content_____

_____

C. Time_____

_____

D. Cost (Please also indicate the part of the total cost [tuition, travel, lodging] for which you personally are paying.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. How did you hear about this workshop?

_____Brochure was sent to me

_____Brochure was sent to friend and referred to me

_____Did not receive a brochure--heard about it from friend

_____Other

Appendix G:

Workshop Trainer Observation Sheet

WORKSHOP TRAINER OBSERVATION SHEET

Data Source

On-site evaluator

Date:_____ Observee:_____

Session No.:_____ Observer:_____

1. How clearly did the workshop trainer present the task instructions?

   Very clear /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Very unclear

2. How clearly did the workshop trainer present any content? (e.g., rationale, introduction, subject matter, etc.)

   Very clear /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Very unclear

3. Did the matter of participant expectations come up during this session?

   Yes_____ No_____

4. How did the workshop trainer deal with it?

5. How well did the workshop trainer adjust his presentations so that participants could understand them?

   Very clear, adjusted very well /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Very obscure, did not adjust at all

6. How did the workshop trainer handle the materials?

   Very poorly, seemed confused /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Very well, went smoothly

7. What was the workshop trainer's attitude towards the materials?

   Seemed to value and enjoy them /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Seemed to devalue and dislike them

8. What was the general feeling tone between the workshop trainer and the workshop participant?

   No rapport, bad feelings and tension /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Good rapport, excellent goodwill

WORKSHOP TRAINER OBSERVATION SHEET

9. To what extent did the trainer allow participants to carry out the exercises for themselves?

Stayed out of work groups entirely	/___/___/___/___/___/___/	Extremely involved in work groups

10. Please use the appropriate procedure checklist for this session and note wherever the trainer deviates from the standard procedure; also note the nature of the deviations, if any.

Appendix H:

Postsession Participant Questionnaire

POST-SESSION PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Data Sources

Participants of all workshops

Name:_____

Sex: Male_____ Female_____

Date of Workshop_____

I. The following questions deal with how you feel about the usefulness of the workshop and learnings, for yourself and for others.

1. How useful do you see the skills and concepts you have learned for training, or consulting with, others in your work situation?

Extremely useful	Very useful	Quite useful	Barely useful	Of absolutely no use
5	4	3	2	1

2. Of what value do you think this workshop experience will be to you in your professional life in the future?

Of no value at all	Of relatively little value	Somewhat valuable	Very valuable	Extremely valuable
1	2	3	4	5

3. In all honesty, how much do you plan to use the ideas, skills and/or materials presented in this workshop as an integral part of your work?

Extensively	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Not at all
5	4	3	2	1

4. Would you recommend this workshop to a good friend whose interests are like yours?

Definitely recommend	Probably recommend	Undecided	Probably not recommended	Definitely not recommended
5	4	3	2	1

II. In this section, we are interested in your reaction to the workshop as a whole and its overall objectives.

1. How successful do you feel this workshop was in fulfilling your expectations about what you personally might get out of it?

Not at all successful	Only slightly successful	Quite successful	Very successful	Extremely successful
1	2	3	4	5

2. How clear were you on the workshop's overall objectives?

Very clear	Somewhat clear	Neither clear nor unclear	Somewhat unclear	Very unclear
5	4	3	2	1

POST-SESSION PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

3. How successful do you feel the workshop was in achieving its overall objectives?

Extremely successful	Very successful	Quite successful	Only slightly successful	Not at all successful
5	4	3	2	1

4. Were the accommodations conducive to effective training?

Extremely useful	Very useful	Quite useful	Barely useful	Of no use
5	4	3	2	1

5. Now that the workshop is over, how would you sum up the experience?

Extremely worthwhile	Very worthwhile	Somewhat worthwhile	Of scant worth	Of no worth at all
5	4	3	2	1

III. In this section, we are interested in intended use.

1. Do you have any plans for using the materials you worked with in this workshop to train others? Would you share with us what you have in mind?

2. Do you have any plans for receiving additional training in other ITCP systems: Would you share with us what you have in mind?

Appendix I:

Postsession Participant Questionnaire
(IGE third week session only)

Postsession Questionnaire
Third Week Training
(IGE only)

Data Sources

Third week IGE workshop participants

Code Name:_____

Sex: Male_____ Female_____

Previous Sessions Attended:

_____

_____

I. The purpose(s) of this workshop were as follows:

1.1 To create an awareness of other NWREL products.

1.2 To provide instruction on how products can be adapted.

In this section, we are interested in your reaction to the workshop as a whole and its overall ovjectives.

1. How successful do you feel this workshop was in fulfilling your expectations about what you personally might get out of it?

Not at all successful	Only slightly successful	Quite successful	Very successful	Extremely successful
1	2	3	4	5

2. How clear were you on the workshop's overall objectives?

Very clear	Somewhat clear	Neither clear nor unclear	Somewhat unclear	Very unclear
5	4	3	2	1

3. How successful do you feel the workshop was in achieving its overall objectives?

Extremely successful	Very successful	Quite successful	Only slightly successful	Not at all successful
5	4	3	2	1

4. Now that the workshop is over, how would you sum up the experience?

Extremely worthwhile	Very worthwhile	Somewhat worthwhile	Of scant worth	Of no worth at all
5	4	3	2	1

II. The following quesions deal with how you feel about the usefulness of the workshop and learnings, for yourself and for others.

5. How useful do you see the skills and concepts you have learned for training, or consulting with, others in your work situation?

Extremely useful	Very useful	Quite useful	Barely useful	Of absolutely no use
5	4	3	2	1

6. Of what value do you think this workshop experience will be to you in your professional life in the future?

Of no value at all	Of relatively little value	Somewhat valuable	Very valuable	Extremely valuable
1	2	3	4	5

7. In all honesty, how much do you plan to use the ideas, skills and/or materials presented in this workshop as an integral part of your work?

Extensively	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Not at all
5	4	3	2	1

8. Would you recommend this workshop to a good friend whose interests are like yours?

Definitely recommend	Probably recommend	Undecided	Probably not recommended	Definitely not recommended
5	4	3	2	1

III. In this section we would like your suggestions for improving the presentations/materials used in this workshop.

9. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the presentations and materials used to acquaint the participant with other NWREL products?

10. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the microlab activities?

Appendix J:

Participant Followup Questionnaire

PARTICIPANT FOLLOWUP QUESTIONNAIRE

Data Sources

Participants of all workshops

Name:_____

Sex: Male_____ Female_____

Workshop attended_____

Specific items will be developed to obtain information on the following evaluative questions.

- IGE/FTC Intervention Design: Questions 11-15; 16-30.
- Regional Workshop Design: Questions 8-11.

Appendix K:

Log Instructions

LOG - SUGGESTIONS

Data Source

IGE/Teacher Center
Workshop Participants

The attached notebook is given to you in hopes that you will record descriptions of events, observations and feelings you have that are directly or indirectly related to your participation in the training sessions. The following statements suggest types of information you may want to record. Please feel free to add anything not directly addressed in this list.

1. Description of events which led to or away from training of others in products you were exposed to during these sessions.

2. Feelings about whether these products are responsive to problems which exist in IGE/Teacher Center schools.

3. Descriptions of the ways in which you adapted products for use.

4. The perceived value and/or problems which surfaced when training did occur. The ways in which problems were creatively solved.

5. Description of factors which influenced whether you received additional training in other Lab-developed products.

6. Descriptions of the necessary conditions for use of products in schools, in individuals, in yourself.

7. Descriptions and perceived value of further communications with personnel from ITCP and NWREL.

Appendix L:

Contact Record Form

CONTACT RECORD FORM

(Side A of 5 x 8 card)

- -

State:_____

Agency:_____

Name:_____

Address:_____

Known Characteristics of Person: Date of Agency: Date

- -

(Side B of 5 x 8 card)

- -

Date: Initiator/Activity:

- -